



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/990,567	11/21/2001	Tae-Sung Jung	678-775 (P10024)	2637
66547 7590 01/10/2008 THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, P.C. 333 EARLE OVINGTON BOULEVARD SUITE 701 UNIONDALE, NY 11553			EXAMINER JOO, JOSHUA	
			ART UNIT 2154	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/10/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

AK

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09990567	11/21/01	JUNG, TAE-SUNG	678-775 (P10024)

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, P.C.
333 EARLE OVINGTON BOULEVARD
SUITE 701
UNIONDALE, NY 11553

EXAMINER

Joshua Joo

ART UNIT

PAPER

2154

7

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

According to 37 CFR 1.111 (b) and 37 CFR 1.111 (c), (b) In order to be entitled to reconsideration or further examination, the applicant or patent owner must reply to the Office action. The reply by the applicant or patent owner must be reduced to a writing which distinctly and specifically points out the supposed errors in the examiner's action and must reply to every ground of objection and rejection in the prior Office action. The reply must present arguments pointing out the specific distinctions believed to render the claims, including any newly presented claims, patentable over any applied references. If the reply is with respect to an application, a request may be made that objections or requirements as to form not necessary to further consideration of the claims be held in abeyance until allowable subject matter is indicated. The applicant's or patent owner's reply must appear throughout to be a bona fide attempt to advance the application or the reexamination proceeding to final action. A general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references does not comply with the requirements of this section. (c) In amending in reply to a rejection of claims in an application or patent under reexamination, the applicant or patent owner must clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. The applicant or patent owner must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections.

The amendment dated 10/26/2007 does not meet the requirements of 37 CFR 1.111 (b) and 37 CFR 1.111 (c). Specifically, for claim 1, applicant provides arguments that the amendment is not taught by the applied references, but the arguments do not point out specific distinctions and patentable novelty believed to render the claims patentable over any of the applied references. For claim 11, applicant only argued that the rejection should be withdrawn. Examiner notes that claim 1 and 11 are different in that claim 11 recites, inter alia, "transmitting by the first GGSN an Agent Advertisement message with... information indicating that the first GGSN supports a foreign agent function" while claim 1 recites, "transmitting by the first GGSN an Agent Advertisement message with... information indicating that the second GGSN supports a foreign agent function;". Claim 7 recites, inter alia, "an Agent Advertisement message from a second GGSN... said Agent Advertisement message indicating whether the second GGSN serves as a foreign agent or a gateway foreign agent;". Claim 11 comprises a different feature from claims 1 and 7, and therefore, any arguments for condition of allowance based on claims 1 and 7 do not fully apply to claim 11. Furthermore, arguments do not point out specific distinctions and patentable novelty to render claim 11 patentable over any of the applied references.


NATHAN FLYNN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER